

THE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, APRIL, 1919

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and fifty-eight Branch Committees; 41,300 members in 443 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. THOMAS ALLEN, PRESIDENT
MRS. JOHN BALCH, VICE-PRESIDENT
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. CURTIS GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline

Honorary
Vice-
Presidents

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman

MISS M. LOUISE BROWN

Membership Committee

Chairman

MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Legislative Committee

Chairman

MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Public Interest League

President

MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League

President

MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary

MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT

Corresponding Secretary

MRS. A. H. PARKER

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

THE LATEST SUFFRAGE DEFEAT

The Federal suffrage amendment again went down to defeat in the United States Senate on the 10th of February.

The suffragists had devoted the time since their defeat on the 1st of October to bringing every possible pressure to bear upon Senators. They had followed them everywhere with threats and persuasion. They had induced State legislatures to pass resolutions instructing the Senators how to vote. They had demanded of President Wilson that he cable to individual Senators urgent appeals for the support of the amendment, and he had complied. At the elections in November, they had waged vigorous and venomous campaigns against anti-suffrage Senators who were candidates for re-election. Yet, when they pressed the question again upon the Senate on the 10th of February, every anti-suffrage Senator stood fast. The suffragists had not won over a single opponent. The only change was that Senator Benet of South Carolina, who held his seat for a few months by Gubernatorial appointment, and who made a very effective speech against the amendment in October, had been succeeded by William P. Pollock at the state election in November, and the suffragists secured his support, leaving them one short of the requisite two-thirds, with every Senator recorded by direct vote or by pairs. But Senator Pollock's term of office extended only from the 2d of December to the 3rd of March, 1919, and his successor for the full six years term, Senator Nathaniel B. Dial, is not counted on the suffrage side.

The vote on the amendment was 55 in favor and 29 opposed; with 12 Senators paired,—two affirmative votes and one negative being repre-

sented in each pair. The actual division, including pairs, was 63 in favor to 33 opposed. Thirty-three Republicans and 30 Democrats voted or were paired in favor of the amendment, and 12 Republicans and 21 Democrats voted or were paired against it.

Here is a list, divided by parties, of the Senators who stood their ground, and refused to be coerced into voting for the amendment:

Democrats:

John H. Bankhead	Alabama
J. C. W. Beckham	Kentucky
Duncan U. Fletcher	Florida
Edward J. Gay	Louisiana
Thomas W. Hardwick	Georgia
Gilbert M. Hitchcock	Nebraska
Thomas S. Martin	Virginia
Lee S. Overman	North Carolina
Atlee Pomerene	Ohio
Willard Saulsbury	Delaware
John K. Shields	Tennessee
James A. Reed	Missouri
Furnifold McL. Simmons	North Carolina
Hoke Smith	Georgia
John Walter Smith	Maryland
Ellison D. Smith	South Carolina
Claude A. Swanson	Virginia
Park Trammel	Florida
Oscar W. Underwood	Alabama
John Sharp Williams	Mississippi
Josiah O. Wolcott	Delaware

Republicans:

David Baird	New Jersey
William E. Borah	Idaho
Frank B. Brandegee	Connecticut
William P. Dillingham	Vermont
Frederick Hale	Maryland
Henry Cabot Lodge	Massachusetts
Philander C. Knox	Pennsylvania
George P. McLean	Connecticut
George H. Moses	New Hampshire
Boies Penrose	Pennsylvania
James W. Wadsworth, Jr.	New York
John W. Weeks	Massachusetts

These men are entitled to nationwide gratitude for successfully resisting the suffrage attack on the 10th of February.

AN OBJECT LESSON FOR MASSACHUSETTS

The demonstrations of the "picketers" of the National Woman's Party, on the occasion of the President's visit to Boston, afforded the first opportunity for Massachusetts to witness suffrage performances of the militant type.

Massachusetts suffragists of the conservative type immediately disavowed responsibility, and tried to minimize the lawlessness of the other wing of the movement. Mrs. Shaw, President of the Boston Equal Suffrage Association for Good Government, described the militants as "a handful of women" and "a small group compared with the regular suffrage association"; and Miss Blackwell, while deprecating "the unwise behavior" of the militants, said, in a letter to the *Boston Herald*, "The most extreme behavior of the 'picketers' is nothing to the extravagances often committed by men in pursuit of self-government."

As to the National Woman's Party being only "a small group," it is at this moment fully organized in 41 States, with State headquarters and State Chairmen; and it is organized in 175 Congressional Districts, with Congressional District Chairmen. Its Treasurer's Report shows a net total of receipts, from December, 1912, to February, 1919, of \$467,549.94. When it asked for a special gift of \$50,000, to enable it to secure the one needed vote in the Senate, it got the amount in one week. Its collections for the two weeks from Jan. 6 through Jan. 21, 1919, were \$3,798.40, or nearly \$300 larger than the contributions to the National American Woman Suffrage Association for the entire month of January. If the latter body were able to show an organization equally extended, and equally supported by gifts, we could certainly count upon its organ, the *Woman Citizen*, to do so. It would be a great deal more effective than sniffing at its rival as "a small group" or "a handful."

Mrs. Shaw claims that "The militant tactics of the Woman's Party have been repeatedly condemned by both the National Association and the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association," and Miss Blackwell says, "We have condemned their actions over and over again in emphatic resolutions." The fact is that it is only when the militant faction carries its demonstrations so far as to threaten serious injury to the cause that the other group finds it necessary to disavow its antics. Even then, it more often keeps silent. The *Woman Citizen*, its organ, to which Miss Blackwell is leading editorial contributor, had not a word of criticism in its issues last August, immediately following the "picketers'" outbreaks at Washington, and again, it did not even mildly deprecate the burning of the President in effigy in February.

But the National Woman's Party is not only not "a small group" or "a handful of women" but it is a body with which the National American Woman Suffrage Association does not hesitate to co-operate. Mrs. Thomas Allen, President of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, seized the psychological moment in February, when Mrs. Shaw, speaking for the conservative suffragists, assured Mayor Peters that the heckling National Woman's Party had "no connection whatever with the great body of suffragists numbering millions of members," etc., to publish evidence going to show direct co-operation between the two organizations. This evidence, originally collated by the *Woman Patriot*, showed that, in Dec., 1915, at the annual convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association, it was voted that there should be "frequent conferences between the legislative committees of the two associations," and that "at least, the legislative committees co-operate"; that evidence of this co-operation may be seen at any time, at any place, where both lobby committees are present, a recent case in point being the frequent consultations of Miss Hay, vice-

president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, with Miss Maud Younger, official leader of the "picket" lobbyists, who took turns and relieved each other in watching the proceedings of the United States Senate; that, in the lobbying of the New Hampshire Legislature in January, for the adoption of a resolution instructing its United States Senator to vote for the federal suffrage amendment, Mrs. Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, was director-general of the suffrage "pickets" at the State House at Concord, and actually held an informal reception for them, and left them in charge of the campaign, in which the State Association fully co-operated with the suffrage "pickets"; and that, in September, 1918, when the "pickets" first burned a statement by President Wilson, the paper was actually turned over to the "pickets" by one of the "conservative" suffragists who had just been a guest of the President.

This evidence of the practical affiliation of the two groups of suffragists, which conservative Massachusetts suffragists have so desperately striven to camouflage, is corroborated by an incident in the United States Senate last August. Senators Thomas and McKellar, both ardent suffragists, had severely condemned the recent outbreaks of the "picketers," but endeavored to make it appear that the two organizations were "entirely separate" and that there was "a very great difference in their purposes." Thereupon Senator Wadsworth said:

"For many, many months, Senators, we have seen these two groups, if we may call them two groups, of women working together in the lobbies of the Senate, conferring together in utmost friendship, comparing notes, importuning Senators, with no distinction as between the two groups, addressing each other by their Christian names, with no sign of enmity between them."

Not a single Senator ventured to call this statement in question, for all the Senators had witnessed, day after day, the open alliance which Senator Wadsworth described.

THAT THIRD STEP

The third step, to which the January REMONSTRANCE referred in the article on "Three Steps Toward Chaos"—the step from Socialism to Bolshevism—is already sufficiently imminent to call for serious investigation.

On Sunday, Feb. 2, a public meeting was held in a theatre at Washington, at which the Russian Soviet government was praised as superior to the American form of government. The meeting was addressed, among others, by Representative Mason of Illinois.

Some of the utterances at the meeting were so extraordinary, and so suggestive of a hostile propaganda that Senator Poindexter of Washington thought it necessary to introduce a resolution calling upon the Department of Justice to investigate them. Reference was made in the Senate debate to the recent publication in a St. Louis newspaper of a proclamation entitled "Lenine's appeal to the Bolshevik of America."

The outcome of the debate was the adoption, without a dissenting vote, of a resolution authorizing the Judiciary Sub-Committee "to inquire concerning any efforts being made to propagate in this country the principles of any party exercising or claiming to exercise authority in Russia, whether such efforts originate in this country or are incited or financed from abroad, and further to inquire into any effort to incite the overthrow of the government of this country by force, or by the destruction of life or property or the general cessation of industry."

The Senate would not have adopted such a resolution as this by a unanimous vote if it had not been convinced that the country was facing a real peril by the spread of Bolshevik principles through an unscrupulous and well-financed propaganda. There is reason to believe that the Lenine-Trotsky group of anarchists dream of a worldwide overthrow of governments, de-

struction of property, and confiscation of capital. It is for this that they are murdering and looting, right and left, in Russia and in Central Europe and in South America. They see a fertile field for their activities in the United States—a country which allows so great freedom of speech and political activity that even the most destructive propaganda can escape notice until the mischief is done. Only recently, Massachusetts cities have found their billboards and public buildings pasted and placarded overnight with posters coming from no one knows where, signed "American Anarchists," and threatening violence.

The peril is one that cannot safely be overlooked. The Senate took action none too soon.

ABUSING THEIR FRIENDS

The termagant temper and general unreasonableness of the suffragists are strikingly shown in the way in which they abuse their friends, when they prove to be unable to get for them what they want.

Their treatment of President Wilson is an illustration. The President threw all precedents and proprieties to the winds when he went before the Senate to urge the adoption of the suffrage amendment, and when he wrote letters to Senators, to candidates, and to Legislatures urging favorable action on suffrage.

Yet, last January, the National Woman's Party, day after day, made bonfires of the President's speeches, and flaunted a banner saying:

PRESIDENT WILSON IS DECEIVING
THE WORLD WHEN HE APPEARS
AS THE PROPHET OF
DEMOCRACY.

PRESIDENT WILSON HAS OPPOSED
THOSE WHO DEMAND DEMOCRACY
FOR THIS COUNTRY.

HE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DIS-
FRANCHISEMENT OF MILLIONS
OF AMERICANS.

WE IN AMERICA KNOW THIS.
THE WORLD WILL FIND HIM OUT.

Senator Jones, Chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, has been fairly subservient in his attitude to the suffragists. He has moved to bring up their measure when they wanted it, and has held it back when they wanted it held back; yet, on the 9th of January, in an official statement, trying to explain their antics in front of the White House, they said: "The Democratic Chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee does not show the faintest sense of responsibility."

Senator Jones, as well as President Wilson, may well feel that it is a thankless task to try to serve the suffragists.

WOMEN AND JURIES

New York suffragists are greatly interested in a bill which has been introduced in the Legislature allowing women to sit on juries.

The bill enables women to sit on juries, but does not force them to do so unless they want to. Luckless men whose names are drawn for jury service have no alternative. They must leave their homes and business for weeks at a time; endure stuffy court rooms; and sit late into the night while stubborn or ill-informed colleagues are making up their minds.

But with women, the case is different. What the suffragists insist that they want is equality. What they really ask is privilege. If a case appeals to their caprice they would like a chance to help settle it. Otherwise, they want to claim exemption on the ground of sex.

It is worthy of notice that the suffrage States have not been eager to put their women into the jury box. Whether their reluctance springs from consideration for the women, or for the cause of justice, is open to dispute. But there is only one State—Idaho—which treats women as the exact equals of men, in jury service. There are five other States—California, Kansas, Utah, Nevada and Colorado—which allow women to sit on juries, if they wish to do so. That finishes the list.

MUST BEGIN AGAIN

The suffragists are now under the painful necessity of beginning again. The advent of a new Congress nullifies all incomplete legislation of the old. The suffrage "victory" of the 10th of January, 1918, over which there has been so much suffrage rejoicing, is wiped off the slate.

Perhaps it is just as well for the suffrage cause that it should be, for it was a doubtful victory at the best. The suffrage amendment, when voted on in the House of Representatives on the 10th of January, 1918, received 274 affirmative votes. But the provision of the Constitution regarding amendments reads "The Congress, *whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary*, etc." There are 435 members of the House of Representatives. Two-thirds of that number is 290. On the 10th of January, the vote was 16 short of that. It was not "two-thirds of the House," therefore, but only two-thirds of those who happened to be present, who "deemed it necessary" to force woman suffrage upon States which do not want it. If the suffragists had succeeded in pushing the proposal through the Senate of the Congress just adjourned, the validity of the amendment would have been open to dispute and litigation because of the shortage of votes in the House.

The suffragists will now play their game with a view to getting as many as possible Republican votes in the House and Senate of the new Congress. They will be ready to promise anything for Republican support. Their campaign becomes now a game of trade and dicker, regardless of all principles involved,—the familiar game of "You vote for me, and I'll vote for you."

But thoughtful Republicans, who reflect upon this proffer, will be inclined to test its value by studying the results of woman suffrage in New York, the only State of importance in which accurate figures are at hand. They will find that one of the first

results was to depose Governor Whitman, Republican, and an ardent suffragist, and to elect Governor Smith, Democrat. In 1916, without women's votes, the Republican plurality for Whitman was 163,158. In 1918, with women voting, that plurality vanished and in its place was a Democratic plurality of 77,148. They will find that while, in the 65th Congress there were six more Democrats than Republicans, in the 66th Congress, there are forty-five more Republicans than Democrats, but none of this increased Republican strength came from New York, the Republican representation from that State being exactly the same in the two Congresses. They will find that the party which had most reason to feel buoyant over the result of woman suffrage was the Socialist, which, with women voting, in 1918, more than doubled its vote of 1916, before women voted, and elected ten members of the Legislature, where it had only one before.

A sobering reflection for the suffragists is that they have the slenderest possible chance of fulfilling their boastful prophecy of nation-wide suffrage in 1920. If they were to cajole the 66th Congress into adopting the amendment, they could not secure ratification next year by enough Legislatures to carry their point, and this for the excellent reason that there would not be enough Legislatures in session. The even-numbered years are "off years" for State Legislatures. There are only eleven States in which Legislatures are due to assemble in 1920—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Georgia, South Carolina, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi and Virginia. It would not be until 1921, at the earliest, that the amendment, if favorably acted on by Congress, could make any appreciable headway toward ratification by the 36 Legislatures necessary. And there is time for a good many things to happen before 1921.

PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE
HALTED

The suffrage campaign in the State Legislatures this year has been mainly devoted to two lines of effort: 1st, the adoption of resolutions instructing United States Senators how they should vote; and 2d, the slipping through, with little or no consideration, of Presidential suffrage bills.

Whenever the suffragists succeed in cajoling a Legislature into passing a Presidential suffrage bill, they immediately add the total adult female population of the State to the number of women voters who, they say, are to have a share in electing a President in 1920.

While some Governors choose to stand aside, and, under suffrage pressure, approve anything that the Legislatures send them, it is well that they are not all so constituted. Governor Percival W. Clement of Vermont deserves special praise for halting the Presidential suffrage bill in that State with a veto message, directing attention to the fact that the bill was in direct violation of the Constitution of the State. The Governor thereby incurred the bitter enmity of the suffragists, but he vindicated the authority of constitutional government in these words:

"It is a fundamental principle of law that the constitution of a state, framed by a convention elected for that purpose and adopted by the people, embodies their supreme original will; and wherever the constitution has prescribed the qualifications of electors, they cannot be changed or added to by the legislature otherwise than by an amendment to the constitution. The constitution of Vermont, from which the legislature derives its powers, in prescribing what those powers shall be, adds this express prohibition: 'They shall have no power to add to, alter or abolish any part of this Constitution.' It follows that, the constitution having determined what the qualifications of voters for presidential electors shall be, the legislature can pass no act which shall add to, alter or abolish any of those qualifications."

CHANGING THE ANTHONY AMENDMENT

Until this year, the suffragists have insisted that the Anthony amendment was something too sacred to be altered. It must be put through exactly as it stood. Senator Jones, representing the suffragists, has sternly resisted all attempts to modify or amend it.

But the defeat of the 10th of February seems to have convinced the suffrage leaders that the amendment must somehow be doctored to secure the missing votes. Senator Gay of Louisiana was induced to present one form of compromise, and Senator McKellar of Tennessee another; but the form agreed upon, and sponsored by Senator Jones, was this: In place of section 2 which, in the original Anthony amendment, read "Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provision of this article," there appears a new section 2, which reads:

"The several States shall have the authority to enforce this article by necessary legislation, but if any State shall enforce or enact any law in conflict therewith, then Congress shall not be excluded from enacting appropriate legislation to enforce it."

The obvious purpose is to beguile Southern Senators into supposing that, through State action or inaction, they can practically nullify the provision of Section 1: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be *denied or abridged* by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Even the *Woman Citizen* is not convinced of the wisdom of this strategy, for, while it says that "the Democrats have claimed that they can deliver the necessary votes under the new forms proposed," it adds pensively "*Whether the Republicans would be as hospitably inclined to the new forms as to the old has been open to question.*"

"ONE JEANNETTE RANKIN ENOUGH"

Commenting upon the results of the British elections, the *Lowell Courier-Citizen* remarked:

"The rather unwelcome feature of the British election is the almost complete failure of the women candidates. Whether or not these would have added to the effectiveness and value of the coming session, it is at least true that electing a few of them would have afforded an easy and gradual introduction of women to the tasks of legislation—which is desirable in the extreme. One Jeannette Rankin is usually enough to awaken women to the necessities of such a case, and the novelty soon wears off."

It is quite true—though in a different sense from that in which the *Courier-Citizen* uses the phrase—that "one Jeannette Rankin is enough." It has proved so in this country, for Miss Rankin has been retired from her seat in the House, where she sobbed over the declaration of war; and her strenuous efforts to get a seat in the Senate failed, as also the similar attempt of Anne Martin in Nevada. The British voters had no such object lesson to guide them, but they got along well without it. They did not take the woman candidacies seriously. Of the sixteen women who ran—some as Liberals, some as Independents, some as Labour representatives and one for the Sinn Fein, only one was elected—the Countess Markiewicz, who was elected by a Sinn Fein constituency, with the distinct understanding that she would not take her seat.

The new British Parliament, therefore, will not have the opportunity of being enlightened by the performances of one Jeannette Rankin.

THE BOLSHEVIST PROGRAM

The so-called "International Communist Congress" has announced its decision to convoke the first congress of "a new revolutionary internationale." The manifesto declaring this intention affords a good opportunity to learn at first hand the precise aims of the movement toward which Socialism, reenforced by woman suffrage, is tending.

The document declares that the present is the period for the overthrow of the world's capitalistic system. The proletariat, it declares, must take

over governmental power, and place it in the hands of a dictatorship constituted by the class of small workers, peasants and agricultural workers. This dictatorship, it insists, must immediately expropriate capitalism and suppress private property, transferring it to the state. The first step is to disarm the bourgeoisie, and to arm the proletariat, which will begin at once an open armed conflict against the ruling power.

The manifesto is not ambiguous as to the kind of warfare which it is meant to wage, or as to the methods to be used. In dealing with those who oppose the proposed revolution, it says, "there is no alternative than to fight without mercy."

This is what has been done by the Spartacans in Berlin. It is what is being done by the Bolsheviks in Russia. It is what would be done by the I. W. W., the radical Socialists, and the other followers of the red flag in this country, if they were not, for the present, restrained by the fear of consequences. Universal robbery, destruction and murder make up the Bolshevik program; and, to borrow the suffragist slogan, not a few of the Bolshevik leaders believe that this is "the time of times" to begin.

ONE of the grievances which the Woman's Party brings against President Wilson is that "he has permitted the floor leader and spokesman of his party to lead in the Senate the opposition against the enfranchisement of women." Do the suffragists suppose that the make-up of Senate committees waits upon the "permission" of the President? That would be an autocracy indeed.

ONLY a year and half ago, the voters of Maine, by a nearly two to one majority, defeated a woman suffrage amendment to the State Constitution. Yet, on the 11th of March, the Maine Senate, by a vote of 22 to 5, refused to give the voters a chance to vote on the pending Presidential suffrage bill, and passed it over their heads. Legislators who are so indifferent to the expressed will of the people should hear from their constituents.

WITHOUT AUTHORITY

Suffragists who have been besieging the members of State Legislatures this year, asking them to vote for resolutions directing the United States Senators from their States to vote for the suffrage amendment, seem to have found it convenient to forget that the old relation between United States Senators and Legislators no longer exists.

Formerly, Senators were elected by the Legislatures; and although, after election, their freedom of action was generally respected, and it would have been thought a matter of doubtful courtesy for Legislatures to assume to instruct them as to the way in which they should vote, such action, in extreme cases, might have been permissible. But, since the ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution in 1913, United States Senators have been chosen by popular vote. Legislatures have nothing to do with their selection. It is as absurd for them to pass resolutions of instruction, telling them what they ought to do, as it would be for groups of selectmen of towns or city councils to take similar action.

This fact is forcibly stated in the following resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Women Voters' Anti-Suffrage Party of New York:

"Resolved, That in the canvass of United States Senators on the subject of the proposed Constitutional amendment, which is for the purpose of forcing woman suffrage upon States that have declared they do not want it, it should be impressed upon the Senators and upon State Legislatures that those bodies are not now, as they were formerly, the constituents of the Senators, and that therefore the legislators have no right to instruct Senators. The voters at large are now the only constituents of United States Senators."

It is the "voters at large" that the suffragists are anxious to dodge whenever they can and as long as they can. They describe it as a "humiliation" to appeal to them.

"WHAT HAPPENED IN NEW HAMPSHIRE?"

In the *Woman Citizen* of Jan. 18, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, under the above heading, undertakes to explain the refusal of the New Hampshire Senate, by a vote of 15 to 6, to adopt a resolution instructing Senator Moses to vote for the Anthony Federal amendment.

Mrs. Catt is usually somewhat restrained in her expressions, as compared with the leaders of the competing organization, the National Woman's Party. She has learned that vituperation is not helpful. But, on this occasion, she seems to have forgotten herself. She charges Senators who voted against the resolution with "deliberate falsehood"; with "deliberate and public falsehood"; with breaking "a deliberate and definite promise"; and with being men "whose word cannot be trusted." And of Senator Moses himself, she says: "When the Legislature convened, Senator Moses took a trip to New Hampshire, hired a room in a hotel and made it his office. There he saw a good many members of the Legislature, and it was current opinion that he was using his time and his influence against the resolution, which was certain to be introduced. *The results seem to bear out this conclusion.*"

The tactics which the suffragists followed in New Hampshire were of precisely the sort that deserved defeat. Their object was to secure the adoption of a resolution by the Legislature instructing Senator Moses to vote for the federal amendment. But, instead of waiting for the convening of the Legislature, they sent their agents all over the State, chasing individual members to their homes, and asking them to sign a petition to Senator Moses. The fruit of this labor was a petition purporting to be signed by a majority of the members-elect. Whether all of the signatures were genuine, and how far the members who were cajoled into signing realized the significance of the act, are matters for conjecture. Senator Moses had intimated that he would give attention

to a resolution of instruction from the Legislature; but he very properly insisted that this alleged "petition" did not serve the purpose.

When the resolution was introduced in the Legislature, it was passed by the House, but defeated in the Senate.

The fifteen New Hampshire Senators who stood their ground against the persistent suffrage lobby, and refused to join in the attempt to coerce Senator Moses into voting for suffrage deserve high praise. They were resolute for the right, and their firmness was the means of defeating the suffragist attempt to secure the one vote needed to carry the Anthony amendment through the United States Senate.

BOTH wings of the suffragists are agreed that it is the sacred duty of women who took war work to hold on to their jobs, no matter what may happen to the returning soldiers. The *Suffragist* of Jan. 18 said: "Most emphatically it is not the patriotic duty of any woman to give up her work now, but rather her duty to keep it." That is precisely what Miss Rose Young thinks about it.

WOMEN DO NOT DEMAND THE BALLOT

(From the Columbia, S.C., State)

The women of South Carolina have not risen to demand the ballot. Not five per cent of them, as individuals, or speaking through societies or party organizations, have asked for it. Never have the men of the State passed on the question at the polls. Our Senators will vote as they choose, according to their convictions, but one thing is certain: no representative and no senator has ever gone to Washington from South Carolina, commissioned by the people, by the men or by the women, to vote for the Anthony amendment, or any similar measure.

The evidence, so far as the record counts, is overwhelming that the people of South Carolina are opposed to woman suffrage by federal action. No senator or congressman can vote for the pending amendment and point to any visible sign that the majority of his constituents or even a considerable number of them would indorse his action. That they might indorse it is possible, but practically all of the evidence lies the other way. Such are the cold facts of the case and from the logic of them there is no escape.

SUFFRAGE BLUFF IN INDIANA

The Presidential suffrage bill, enacted by the Indiana Legislature, is exactly what a correspondent of the *Boston Herald* described it, "a bit of suffrage bluff."

Two years ago, the Indiana Legislature passed a partial suffrage bill, over which the suffrage leaders exulted extremely. But neither the legislators nor the suffrage leaders had paid any attention to the clause in the state constitution which expressly limits the suffrage to "male" citizens. When the matter came before the courts, as it did before there had been time for the exercise of the privileges which the measure was supposed to confer, first the Superior Court and then the Supreme Court ruled that the action of the Legislature was in violation of the State Constitution. That instrument contains the following provision:

"In all elections not otherwise provided for in this constitution, every male citizen of the United States . . . shall be entitled to vote in the township or precinct where he may reside."

The view of the Court was that the Constitution meant what it said. It ruled "*That the General Assembly has no authority to extend the right of franchise to persons not included within that definition.*" The Court further ruled:

"*It is clear that any effort on the part of the General Assembly to establish a public electorate which would differ from that defined in Art. II., sec. 2, of the Constitution, must necessarily be in conflict with the manifest purpose of that section.*"

So the "nine-tenths suffrage law" over which the suffragists had been so jubilant was invalidated, and Indiana was wiped off the suffrage map.

Obviously, the principles which controlled in 1917 are equally true in 1919.

Miss Blackwell, in a letter in the *Boston Herald*, expounds the curious idea that "the Constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land, expressly gives the Legislature of every state the right to

say how the Presidential electors from that state shall be chosen."

But the Constitution of the United States, when it provided for the appointment of Presidential electors in each State "in such manner as the Legislature thereof shall direct" did not and could not provide that the manner of appointment might be in direct violation of the Constitution of the State. The Legislature might appoint Presidential electors, as some of them once did, or it might provide for their choice by the voters, as all of them now do; but it could not smash the Constitution of the State in the process. Especially it could not, in the language of the Supreme Court of Indiana, "*establish a public electorate which would differ from that defined*" in the Constitution of the State.

There can be no carrying out of the provisions of the Presidential suffrage bill just enacted in Indiana without doing exactly what the Indiana Supreme Court has decided cannot legally be done, namely, the establishment of a public electorate different from that defined in the State Constitution.

For the second time within a year, the suffragists are making a desperate attempt to carry a Southern State by a direct appeal to the people. They tried it last November in Louisiana, and were defeated. They are trying it now in Texas, and the issue is to be decided at the polls on the 24th of May. It is very important that the conservative forces of the country should rally to repel this raid, for a great deal depends on the result. Texas is a huge state territorially, with an area more than thirty times as large as Massachusetts, and it is no light task to reach a population so widely scattered. It elects eighteen Congressmen; and it will make considerable difference in the new Congress whether these Congressmen feel that they have behind them constituencies which have just rejected woman suffrage. Anti-suffragists, the country over, may well do all that they can to contribute to this result.

A SUFFRAGE sympathizer in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, Mr. Warren C. Daggett, who introduced a bill providing that all women of the State who are qualified to vote for school committee, may vote at the state election next November as to whether they are in favor of national woman suffrage, was amazed when suffrage leaders denounced him and his proposition. He offered the bill in good faith, thinking that it would be well that the Legislature and the voters should know what the women really wanted; but the suffragists, who had professed to believe that they represented the large majority of Massachusetts women, resented the idea of having their claims put to a test. He was still more amazed when, at the hearing before the Committee on Rules, leading suffragists opposed the bill—one of them saying that, if only one woman wanted the ballot, she ought to have it—while forty or fifty anti-suffrage women appeared, to favor the proposed referendum. It is the old story; there is nothing that the suffragists want less than a real test of the desires of women.

SPEAKING at Boston on the 18th of February, Mrs. Catt said: "I cannot imagine anything that can prevent the passing of the amendment in the next Congress or anything happening that will keep the vote from the women longer than 1921 at the very farthest-off date." Hitherto, the suffragists have always set 1920 as the date of their ultimate triumph. Perhaps, by a year from now, the suffrage prophets will set the date still farther ahead.

MISS RANKIN's campaign for the office of Clerk of the House of Representatives in the new Congress was a gloomy failure. The office, with \$6,500 attached, went to a mere man, W. Tyler Page of Maryland.

HEARST AS A PATRIOT

About the last matter regarding which there should have been any divided action was that of the official welcome of American troops returning from France.

But the extraordinary action of Mayor Hylan of New York in appointing William Randolph Hearst Chairman of the Committee of Welcome to Homecoming Troops was so grotesque a travesty upon true patriotism that it called out indignant protests and forced the appointment of an Independent Citizens' Committee to represent the real patriotism of the metropolis.

The pro-German utterances of Mr. Hearst's papers; his open defense of the sinking of the *Lusitania*; his intimate relations with Count von Bernstorff; his association with Bolo Pasha, who was executed in Paris as a traitor; and the fact that, in some communities, a ban had been placed on the sale of his journals, and in some, they had been gathered together in a public square and burned, should have made his appointment on a committee to welcome homecoming troops impossible. Any political advantage which Mayor Hylan may have imagined he would gain by such an appointment is more than offset by the indignation aroused by it.

The announcement of the appointment was followed by the resignation from the Committee of a number of members who found it impossible to be associated with Mr. Hearst in such service, and who promptly helped to form a Citizens' Independent Committee of Welcome.

The Four-Minute Men of Jamaica adopted a resolution addressed to Mayor Hylan in these terms:

"The undersigned solemnly and earnestly protest to your Honor against the appointment of W. R. Hearst on the Committee of Welcome to our returning soldiers, and respectfully, but in the name of patriotism, request his removal from such committee.

"We call your attention to the fact

that, had Mr. Hearst's advice been followed by Mr. Wilson and Congress, there would have been no soldiers to welcome, for all would have been kept at home. Had this happened, the Imperial German Government might have won the war, and the American nation been judged false to all the ideals for which it went to war."

The Women Voters' Anti-Suffrage Party, at a meeting at which Julia L. D. Longfellow presided, adopted this resolution:

"Resolved, That His Honor, the Mayor of the City of New York, be, and hereby is, respectfully and earnestly petitioned to request of William Randolph Hearst his resignation as such Chairman, and to appoint in his place a citizen of distinction in hearty sympathy with the great purposes for which the United States went to war. to the end that our returning soldiers and sailors may feel assured that the welcome tendered them on behalf of the city springs from a genuine sympathy with the cause for which they have made such great sacrifices, as well as deep gratitude for their services to the country."

If the Suffrage Association had been inclined to make a similar protest, doubtless it would have been restrained by the fact that Mr. Hearst has been for some time the leading agent in the suffrage propaganda in this country.

A PROUD DAY FOR SUFFRAGE

The suffragists have been much exhilarated by the fact that the first bill to be passed by the New York Legislature at this year's session was introduced by one of the two women members, Mrs. Ida B. Sammis.

As the *New York Herald's* Albany correspondent finely expressed it, it was passed "under the guiding hand of a woman member." When the bill reached the Governor, there was a considerable gathering of women to see him sign it. Mrs. Sammis and the Assembly leaders stood beside the Governor in the Executive Chamber when he wrote his name and handed the pen to Mrs. Sammis.

And what was the measure which called forth so much emotion, and the signing of which was attended with so much ceremony? Was it a bill for the better regulation of child labor? Or for the purification of elections? Or for better sanitary conditions in factories? Or for pensions for teachers? Or for the closing of dangerous and disreputable resorts?

It was none of these. It was a bill *extending the season for duck shooting on Long Island from December 15 to December 30.*

Just think of it: if it had not been for the ennobling and uplifting influence of woman upon legislation, it might have been forever illegal to shoot ducks on Long Island after the 15th of December.

JANE ADDAMS of Hull House is one of the members of the "Truth About Russia Committee" which has been organized in New York. A statement published by the Committee declares that the Soviet Government in Russia is governing that country "in an orderly fashion," and urges that, in the solution of the Russian problem, the Allies and the United States "should deal with Lenine." This is the same Lenine who, according to a Stockholm despatch of Jan. 28, ordered the Bolshevik troops to retake the town of Narva from the Esthonians within a week "to sack the town and to kill all the bourgeoisie."

CHICAGO'S DEGRADATION

(From the *Boston Herald*, Feb. 28.)

In Chicago, the Republican party, not ordinarily rated as standing for the less patriotic elements of the community, has renominated by a plurality of 40,000, perhaps the most conspicuous German sympathizer among the civil officers in America. He refused to make Joffre a guest of the city. He excluded Liberty bond sellers from the City Hall. The wildness of his unpatriotic talk has been a national scandal.

What is the matter with Chicago? What is the matter with the Republican party? What is the matter with the women voters who were to raise the tone of American public life?